

Post-Call Professional Legal Education – The B.C. Approach

This paper was prepared by John J.L. Hunter Q.C., President of the Law Society of British Columbia (2008), for the Symposium of Lifelong Learning in Professionalism, presented by the Chief Justice of Ontario's Advisory Committee on Professionalism, February 20, 2009, Toronto, Ont.

Post-Call Professional Legal Education – The B.C. Approach

On January 1, 2009, the Law Society of British Columbia introduced the first mandatory program in Canada requiring lawyers to engage in post-call legal education throughout their careers. The program has been termed Continuing Professional Development or CPD. A component of the CPD program is a requirement for ongoing attention to matters of ethics and practice management. In this way the Law Society seeks to emphasize the importance of professionalism as a necessary feature of post-call legal education.

The purpose of this paper is to describe the CPD program and explain the policy choices made by the Law Society in setting its parameters.

Development of the Program

The CPD program was developed over a four-year period.¹ Initially, the Benchers approved a requirement that lawyers report on the number of hours spent each year on formal CLE courses and self-study. This followed an initiative taken by the Law Society of Upper Canada several years earlier. In British Columbia, the reporting requirement was designed to accomplish two objectives. It was designed to obtain data as to the extent that B.C. lawyers were taking CLE courses as lawyers were required to report on such attendance in their annual practice declaration. It was also hoped that the reporting requirement would encourage lawyers to engage in more planned professional development without the necessity of a mandatory program.

The reporting requirement was more successful in the first objective than the second. We did receive hard data on the extent of CLE participation and were a little surprised to

¹ For an overview of the program and copies of the reports leading up to the adoption of the program, see the Law Society of British Columbia website at http://www.lawsociety.bc.ca/licensing_membership/profdev/overview.html

find that about one-third of B.C. lawyers reported no hours of course study². The numbers grew worse with seniority. More than half the lawyers with thirty or more years at the bar reported no hours of course study. Subsequent years demonstrated a slight but not meaningful improvement³.

The Benchers subsequently decided that the time had come to introduce a mandatory professional development program. It was recognized that it is difficult to assemble empirical evidence that such a program increases lawyer competence, and there was some initial resistance from the lawyers in B.C. on that basis. The Benchers concluded that a CPD program need not be based on such a rationale.

It is well known that virtually every other profession in Canada as well as most legal professions outside Canada require continuing formal study to enhance professional competence. CPD was seen as a means of adopting best practices in professional regulation as well as building public confidence in lawyers and their self-regulatory structure. The public interest in lawyers keeping up-to-date in the law and continually enhancing their professional skills is self-evident and after some initial expressions of concern, most lawyers have accepted the CPD program, at least in principle.

In their report to the Benchers, the Lawyer Education Committee identified the goals of a continuing professional development program in this way:

The Committee believes that a continuing professional development program can accomplish the goal of ensuring a wider variety of professional education resources that are easily available and relevant to lawyers at all stages of their practices. Such a program will also ensure that lawyers use education resources. Lawyers will benefit by having a wider array of resources available to assist them in their practice. The public will benefit by being assured that there is a commitment within the profession to the establishment, promotion and improvement of the standards of legal practice in the Province⁴.

² Preliminary Report of the Lawyer Education Task Force to the Benchers, November 15, 2006, page 7, reported at the LSBC website, *supra*.

³ Report of the Lawyer Education Task Force to the Benchers on Continuing Professional Development, November 6, 2007 ("2007 Report"), page 4: LSBC website, *supra*.

⁴ 2007 Report, page 4

In its final report to the Benchers prior to implementation, the Lawyer Education Committee stated that “the introduction of CPD is premised on assuring both the public and the profession that the Law Society is committed to the establishing, maintaining and enhancing standards of legal practice in the province.”⁵

On November 16, 2007, the Benchers approved a mandatory continuing professional development program to commence January 1, 2009.

Nature of the Program

Each year, every lawyer practising in British Columbia must complete at least 12 hours of continuing professional development in accredited educational activities, of which at least two hours must relate to any combination of legal ethics, practice management, and client care and relations. Lawyers can select their own programs, but must obtain accreditation for the program for which they wish credit. The accreditation process is designed to be relatively straightforward – the lawyer advises the Law Society of the program for which credit is sought and unless the Law Society has some reason to believe the program does not meet the CPD objectives, it will be accredited.

The administration of the CPD program is entirely online. A list of accredited programs and courses is being developed. Lawyers will enter their CPD time online on the Law Society website and the Law Society will issue reminders from time to time if time is not being entered.

The centrepiece of this program is a highly flexible menu of professional development options available for lawyers to meet the CPD requirements. There are three content criteria for CPD activities:

- (i) There must be significant intellectual or practical content with the primary objective of increasing lawyers’ professional competence;

⁵ Report to the Benchers of the Lawyer Education Advisory Committee, July 4, 2008, page 2: LSBC website, *infra*.

- (ii) The material should deal with substantive, procedural, ethical, practice management or skills topics relating to the practice of law; and
- (iii) The material must be designed and focused for lawyers, articling students, law school students and / or paralegals employed or supervised by a lawyer, and not be primarily for other professions or the public.

Activities targeted at client development, law firm marketing or lawyer wellness will not be accredited, nor will pure self-study or learning through file work.

While lawyers can earn their credit through traditional CLE courses and local bar association educational programs, the CPD program is designed to be much more flexible than the traditional MCLE program. In addition to formal course work, lawyers can complete their annual professional development requirements in several other ways:

(i) Study Groups

The Law Society has been encouraging lawyers, particularly in areas outside the Lower Mainland where formal CLE courses present cost and logistical challenges, to form study groups with their colleagues to discuss developments in the law or practice that will assist them. The hope is that this will encourage collegiality as well as permitting lawyers to design simple programs that will help them directly in their practices. There are some formal requirements but the intention has been to give lawyers considerable latitude to develop programs that they would find useful.

(ii) Teaching and Writing

Teaching and writing in the law are obvious candidates for CPD credit. These activities must be directed towards lawyers, not other professionals or clients or the public at large. But subject to that, the content will be left to the individual lawyer. Credit cannot, however, be obtained for teaching if one is by profession a law teacher. The hope is that some of our senior

lawyers who may find CLE courses of limited utility will be encouraged in this way to share their wisdom with their younger colleagues.

(iii) Online programs

Online programs qualify for CPD credit but only if there is an interactive aspect to the program including either a quiz component or the opportunity to ask and answer questions.

The CPD program is described in more detail at Appendix A.

CPD not MCLE

In the United States, the primary method of ensuring mandatory professional legal education has been a requirement that lawyers take a certain number of hours of courses designed for post-call learning, known as Mandatory Continuing Legal Education or MCLE⁶.

In British Columbia, with some exceptions⁷, the Law Society does not deliver continuous legal education to its members. CLE is delivered primarily through the Continuing Legal Education Society, an autonomous society sponsored by the Law Society, the CBA and the two BC law schools⁸. Most CLE programming in British Columbia has consisted of lecture and panel discussion format, although recently the CLE Society has begun to develop online and slightly more interactive courses.

In developing our CPD program, the decision was made early in the process that this was not going to be a mandatory CLE program. While lawyers could satisfy their CPD requirements by attending CLE programs if they wished, the intention was that the

⁶ The current requirements of 43 states that require MCLE are summarized at Appendix B.

⁷ One notable exception is the Small Firm Practice Course, an online course developed by the Law Society of British Columbia to help sole practitioners and small firm lawyers manage their practice effectively.

⁸ Members can also obtain CLE programming from subject matter specific providers such as the Trial Lawyers Association of British Columbia and the practice sections of the BC Branch of the Canadian Bar Association.

lawyers would develop their own educational program from a broad menu of options accredited by the Law Society.

This policy choice was made for a number of reasons. While many lawyers, particularly early in their careers, find CLE offerings very useful in keeping up-to-date, many do not. There may be a number of reasons many lawyers resist being told they must attend a specified number of hours of CLE:

- It can be difficult for CLE staff to develop programming that will be useful for everyone. To be effective a course must be aimed at a specific practice area or subject matter knowledge and a particular level of experience.
- For the most part, CLE delivery methods are based on a passive learning environment in which participants sit and listen, with the occasional opportunity to ask a question at the end of the presentation. Some lawyers may learn more effectively from programs in which they take a more active part, either by engaging in a specific skill or by interacting more spontaneously in a smaller group setting.
- CLE courses can be costly, particularly for lawyers who live outside the metropolitan areas.
- As practising lawyers ourselves, we believed that lawyers would respond more positively to a program that allowed them to design their own professional development program, so long as some accreditation parameters were in place to ensure the integrity of the program.

This approach for lawyers whose professional needs may be very different one from another seems consistent with the core concepts of adult education. Several years ago, the American Law Institute and American Bar Association summarized these core concepts in this way⁹:

⁹ *Teaching for Better Learning: Adult Education in CLE*, American Law Institute, 1999, citing M. Knowles, *The Adult Learner: A Neglected Species* (4th ed.) 31 (1990)

- Adults are most willing to invest time and energy in learning something when they understand how it will be useful to them. They prefer to learn those things that can help them do what they want to do.
- Adults bring a lifetime of experience to every learning situation. This experience is a very rich resource for adults' learning. Good adult education takes advantage of this resource and creates opportunities for adults to reflect on and build on their experience.
- Adults prefer to be self-directing. They do not like being talked down to or controlled. They do like participating actively in the planning and implementation of a learning activity. Therefore, an appropriate role for the teacher is to engage in a process of mutual inquiry with them, rather than simply transmit information to them and expect them to accept and conform to it.
- Adults are different from each other in many ways, including how they learn best. Therefore, education of adults should acknowledge and provide for these differences.

The intent behind a CPD rather than MCLE program was to maximize the learning options each professional could utilize to help them in their practices.

The Ethics Component

While the intent is to provide as much flexibility as possible to lawyers to participate in programs that will assist them in practice, there is one content requirement – of the minimum twelve hours of professional development completed by each lawyer, at least two hours must relate to legal ethics, practice management, or client care and relations.

The ethics component is not a novel requirement in mandatory post-call professional legal education. Of the 43 states that have MCLE requirements for their lawyers, 41 of them require that a component of the MCLE be in the area of legal ethics and professional responsibility¹⁰.

In its 2007 Report to the Benchers, the Lawyer Education Committee recommended that at least two hours of the twelve required hours be in the area of legal ethics or practice management on the basis that such focus was necessary to ensure both good

¹⁰ See Appendix B

lawyers and public confidence in the regulation of lawyers¹¹. The Committee recognized that there were not a large number of legal ethics courses available to satisfy this requirement, but took the view that a requirement of this kind would encourage the development of standalone courses that would more effectively address the need for ongoing attention to ethical issues and developments in the law relating to professional responsibility of lawyers.

The focus on legal ethics is consistent with both the developing jurisprudence on the lawyers' special role in society and developing educational theories on the importance of ethical instruction for lawyers¹².

The Educational Plan Alternative

The Law Society of Alberta has recently developed a CPD program as well, but its program does not require that lawyers engage in any approved educational activities. Rather the Alberta CPD program requires that lawyers develop an educational plan for CPD and advise the Law Society of Alberta that they have done so¹³. There is no requirement that the plan be followed, but the assumption is that by requiring lawyers to put their minds to a plan that would suit their own needs, there is a good likelihood that lawyers will then follow the plan they have developed.

The British Columbia approach seeks to marry some of the individual flexibility of the Alberta CPD with the mandatory requirements of most other professions that a plan must not only be made but followed.

¹¹ 2007 Report, page 9

¹² See e.g. *Educating Lawyers: Preparation for the Profession of Law*, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (2007)

¹³ The Alberta CPD Plan is described on their Law Society website at <http://www.lawsocietyalberta.com/lawyerservices/ContinuingProfessionalDevelopment.cfm>

Mentoring

As initially rolled out, the CPD program does not give credit for mentoring, but there is strong support for the inclusion of mentoring as a qualified activity for CPD – both for the professional providing the mentoring and for the professional receiving it.

Approximately one-quarter of the lawyers in British Columbia practice as sole practitioners. In addition, lawyers who practice in smaller communities frequently do not have access to training opportunities or to more experienced lawyers.

The object of a mentoring program is to develop a relationship whereby one lawyer, usually though not necessarily a senior lawyer, provides guidance or advice to another, usually more junior lawyer. It is likely that for a mentoring program to qualify as CPD in British Columbia it will be necessary for the parties to develop a Mentoring Plan with significant intellectual or practical content involving substantive, procedural, ethical or practice management matters relating to the practice of law.

It is likely that a mentoring component will be introduced in the CPD program later on this year, provided satisfactory parameters can be developed and the Benchers approve this addition to the program.

Conclusion

This is the first year of the program and there will no doubt be some challenges in changing the culture of practice by imposing an external requirement for some form of ongoing professional development. Early signs are encouraging though. Large firms have had professional development programs for some time, but now smaller firms are beginning to set them up and require their lawyers to attend. In areas outside the Lower Mainland, sole practitioners are organizing lunch meetings to discuss matters of relevance to their practices. CBA section meeting attendance appears to be up. Lawyers appear to have accepted the policy reasons behind the requirements and are responding to the flexibility of the program.

There will no doubt be modifications to the program as we learn from the experience of introducing these mandatory requirements. Nevertheless it remains the view of the British Columbia Benchers that such a program is appropriate to better ensure that the public has access to a competent, ethical and well-regulated legal profession.

John J.L. Hunter Q.C.
February 20, 2009

APPENDIX A -- Outline of the CPD Program in BC

(a) Overall Subject Matter Requirement

The subject matter of all accredited learning modes, including courses, must satisfy the following content criteria:

1. significant, intellectual, or practical content, with the primary objective of increasing lawyers' professional competence;
2. material dealing primarily with substantive, procedural, ethical, practice management (including client care and relations) or skills topics relating to the practice of law;
3. material designed and focused for lawyers, articling students, law school students and / or paralegals employed or supervised by lawyers, not just primarily for other professions (such as courses for business leaders, including leadership skills, management skills, project management, facilitation, how to run an effective meeting, marketing skills).

Accredited learning activities are not limited to subject matter dealing with primarily BC or Canadian law. Credits are available for subject matter related to the law of other provinces and countries.

The following activities will not be accredited:

1. any activity designed for or targeted at clients,
2. topics relating to law firm marketing or maximizing profit,
3. lawyer wellness topics.

(b) Credit Available for Participation in Courses

Courses are accredited based on the following criteria:

1. generally, credit is given for actual time in attendance at a course;
2. two or more lawyers reviewing together a previously recorded course are able to obtain credit;

3. credit is available for the actual time participating in online “real time” courses, streaming video, web and /or teleconference courses, if there is an opportunity to ask and answer questions.

(c) Credit Available for Education Activities other than Courses

Education other than courses is available for credit, based on the following criteria:

(i) Teaching

1. The teaching must be to an audience that includes, primarily, lawyers, paralegals (employed by law firms and legal departments), articling students and /or law school students. Accreditation for teaching is not available if it is targeted primarily at clients, the public, other professions, or students other than law students.
2. Three hours of credit are available for each hour taught. If the lawyer is only “chairing” a program, however, the actual time spent chairing the program is all that may be reported (not 3 hours per hour of chairing).
3. Credit is available for the first time the teaching activity is performed in the reporting year. Credit is not available for repeat teaching of substantially the same subject matter within the same reporting year.
4. Credit is available for volunteer or part-time teaching only, not as part of full-time or regular employment.
5. Credit is available for teaching in legal skills training courses.
6. For 2009, credit is not available for mentoring. Mentoring will be the subject of further Law Society consideration.

(ii) Writing

Credit is available for writing as follows:

1. writing law books or articles that are intended for publication or to be included in course materials;
2. credit is based on actual time to produce the final product, to a maximum of 6 hours per writing project;
3. credit is available for volunteer or part-time writing only, not when it is done as a part of full-time or regular employment;

4. the available credit is in addition to any credit available for teaching and preparation for teaching;
5. credit is not available for preparation of PowerPoint materials.

(iii) Study Groups

Credit for study group activity is available as follows:

1. attendance in a group setting at an educational session in a law firm, legal department, government agency or similar entity, if at least two lawyers are together (including by telephone) at the same time;
2. attendance at editorial advisory board meetings for legal publications;
3. the hours available for credit are the actual time spent at the study group meeting, excluding any time that is not related to educational activities;
4. credit is not available for activity that is file specific;
5. a lawyer must have overall administrative responsibility for each study group session, and a lawyer must chair each session;
6. no credit is available for time spent reading materials, handouts or PowerPoint, whether before or after the study group session.

(iv) Local Bar and Canadian Bar Association Section Meetings

1. Credit is available for the actual time spent attending an educational program provided by a local or county bar association in BC, as well as for section meetings of the Canadian Bar Association, excluding any portion of the meeting not devoted to educational activities.
2. To qualify, at least two lawyers must participate in the activity at the same time, including by telephone.

(v) Online Programs

A. Group Event

1. Credit is available for the actual time spent by the lawyer participating in online “real time” programs, streaming video, web and/or teleconference programs, but only if, through the program offering, there is an opportunity to ask and answer questions.
2. The credit available includes a study group’s review of a previously recorded program.

B. Self-Study online education

1. Credit is available for online education on one’s own for up to a pre-accredited limit per online program, as well as for completing an audio, video or web program, if the program includes the following characteristics:
 - (a) a quiz component, where questions are to be answered, and where an answer guide is provided to the lawyer after the lawyer completes the program and quiz. It is not necessary for the lawyer to submit the quiz for review;
 - (b) the quiz can be at the end of or interspersed throughout the program;
 - (c) there is an ability for the lawyer to email or telephone a designated moderator with questions, and a timely reply;
 - (d) there is no requirement for a “listserv;”
 - (e) there is no requirement that reading materials, handouts or PowerPoint be included.

C. Listserv/forum /network site

1. These forms of learning are under consideration, and will not be available for credit for the 2009 calendar year.

(d) Accreditation Process

1. All reportable credits can be approved by the Law Society in either of two ways:
 - (i) by pre-approval of the provider; or
 - (ii) approval (before or after the event) of individual courses and other educational activities.
2. An individual course or other educational activity offered by a pre-approved provider does not require further approval unless requested by the provider.
3. Providers are pre-approved and remain pre-approved if they maintain integrity and quality according to standards.

4. Lawyers can individually apply for approval of courses, either before or after the course or other educational activity takes place, where the course has not otherwise been approved.
5. All applications by providers and lawyers are to be submitted electronically.
6. Approvals are made by Law Society staff.

(e) Compliance and Reporting Requirements

1. The CPD requirement is based on the calendar year, with the compliance date being December 31 each year.
2. Lawyers login to the Law Society website and click on a link to the program, where they are shown their individual credits and time remaining to comply with the CPD requirement for the calendar year. After completing a course or other accredited learning activity, lawyers can add that to their record.
3. The lawyer will be notified electronically by the Law Society of the approaching calendar deadline and, if the deadline is not met, will be given an automatic extension to April 1 of the following year to complete the necessary requirement (in which case a late fee of \$200 will be charged). If the requirement is still not met by April 1, the lawyer may be suspended for non-completion on 60 days notice from the Law Society. The Law Society's Practice Standards Committee has the discretion to prevent or delay the suspension in special circumstances on application by a lawyer to do so.
4. The twelve hour requirement is subject to adjustment for entering or re-entering practice mid-year. Members who have been exempt during the reporting year, but who resume practising law within the reporting year, must complete one credit hour for each full or partial calendar month in the practice of law.
5. Embedded ethical, practice management, and client care and relations content complies with the two hour requirement. Providers are also encouraged to offer non-embedded content.

(f) Exemptions

1. All Law Society members with a practicing certificate, whether full or part-time, are subject to the requirement, with the following exemptions:

- (a) lawyers with a current practicing certificate who submit a declaration that they are not practising law. Examples of lawyers who might submit a declaration that they are not practising law could include:
- inactive members;
 - members on medical or maternity leave;
 - members taking a sabbatical;
- (b) new members who complete the bar admission program of a Canadian law society during the reporting year;
- (c) a partial exemption is available to lawyers who resume practising law within the reporting year after having been exempt, and new members by way of transfer (subject to b, above). These lawyers must complete one credit hour for each full or partial calendar month in the practice of law;
- (d) no exemption is available for
- being too busy (such as a long trial);
 - the practice of law having been in another jurisdiction.

APPENDIX B – MCLE State Requirements

The following 43 jurisdictions require lawyers to take MCLE courses in order to practice law within that particular jurisdiction:

Alabama

The following requirements are currently under review: Two year reporting period with 24 credits of approved CLE including 2 ethics credits per reporting period.

Alaska

3 hrs. of ethics per calendar year, plus a recommended (but not mandated) 9 hours

Arizona

15 hrs. Per calendar year including 3 hrs. ethics/professional responsibility, professionalism, substance abuse, or ADR.

Arkansas

12 hrs. Per year including 1 hour of legal ethics.

California

25 hrs. over 3-year period including 4 hrs. of legal ethics; 1 hr. substance abuse and 1 hr. elimination of bias in the profession.

Colorado

45 hrs. over 3-year period including 7 hrs. legal ethics, professionalism.

Delaware

24 hrs. over 2-year period including 4 hrs. Enhanced Ethics, Fundamentals of Law 3-day series for new admittees within 4 years of admission.

Florida

30 hrs. over 3-year period including 5hrs. legal ethics, professionalism, substance abuse, or mental illness awareness; basic skills course for newly admitted attorneys.

Georgia

12 hrs. per year including 1 hr. legal ethics, professionalism, basic skills within 1st 2 yrs., ADR 3 hrs. one time only.

Idaho

30 hrs. over 3-year period including 2 hrs. legal ethics, basic skills course for new admittees.

Illinois

20 hrs. of CLE activity during the initial two-year reporting period. Increases to 24 hrs. for the subsequent reporting period. Four of the total hours required for any two-year period must be in the area of professionalism, diversity issues, mental illness and addiction issues, civility, or legal ethics.

Indiana

36 hrs. over 3 calendar year period with 6 hr. minimum per year including 3 hrs. legal ethics.

Iowa

15 hrs. per calendar year including 2 hrs. legal ethics every 2 years.

Kansas

12 hrs. per year including 2 hrs. legal ethics.

Kentucky

12.50 hrs. per year including 2 hrs. legal ethics, new lawyer skills training within 12 mos. of admission.

Louisiana

12.50 hrs per year including 1 hr ethics and 1 hr professionalism. Newly admitted attorneys need 12.50 hrs including 8 hrs ethics, professionalism or law practice management. CLE Completion deadline: December 31.

Maine

Eleven hours per year including 1 hour ethics/professional responsibility.

Minnesota

45 hrs. over 3-year period, 3 hrs. legal ethics, 2 hrs. elimination of bias required, maximum of 6hrs. law office management.

Mississippi

12 hrs. per year including 1 hr. legal ethics, professional responsibility, or malpractice prevention each year.

Missouri

15 hours per year including 3 hrs. ethics every 3 years, new admittees 3 hrs. professionalism, legal/judicial ethics within 12 mos.

Montana

15 hrs. per year.

Nevada

12 hrs. per year of which 2 must be in ethics.

New Hampshire

12 hrs. per year/at least 6 must be earned by attendance at live CLE programs, including 2 hrs legal ethics/professionalism, or substance abuse.

New Mexico

12 hours per year including one (1) hr ethics, one (1) credit must be professionalism.

New York

Newly Admitted Attorneys: Practicing less than 2 years in NY (or less than 5 years in another jurisdiction immediately preceding admission to the NY Bar.)

32 hrs. "transitional" education within the first two years admission to the Bar. 16 hrs. completed each year including 3 hrs ethics/professionalism, 6 hrs. practical skills, 7 hrs. practice management and areas of professional practice.

"Transitional" courses help newly admitted attorneys develop a foundation in practical skills, techniques and procedures.

Experienced Attorneys:

24 hrs. over two year period including 4 hrs. ethics/professionalism

North Carolina

12 hrs. per year including 2 hrs. ethics, 9 of the 12 hrs. in practical skills during first 3 yrs. of admission, and 1 hr. substance abuse or debilitating mental conditions every 3 yrs. Reporting date: February 28.

North Dakota

45 hrs. over 3-year period, 3 hrs. ethics every 3 yrs.

Ohio

24 hrs. every two years including 2 hr. of ethics based on the Code of Professional Responsibility, 1 hr. of professionalism based on A Lawyer's Creed and A Lawyer's Aspirational Ideals and thirty minutes of substance abuse education that includes a discussion of prevention, detection, causes and treatment alternatives.

Attorneys can only receive self-study credit for courses approved by the Commission for self-study credits. Additionally, self-study hours are capped and attorneys can only receive 6 hours of self-study credit every two years. This includes audio, video, internet-based, and CD-Rom based educational activities.

Oklahoma

12 hrs. per year including 1 hr. ethics.

Oregon

45 hrs. over 3-year period including 6 hrs. ethics, 1 of those 6 hrs. on child abuse reporting, 3 of the general hours must be in courses pertaining to the role of

lawyers concerning racial and ethnic issues, gender fairness, disability issues, and access to justice. New admittees-15 hrs. of which 10 must be in practical skills and 2 hrs. in ethics.

Pennsylvania

12 hrs. per year for all 3 compliance groups. 1 hr. ethics, professionalism, or substance abuse and a minimum of 11 hrs. of substantive law, practice and procedure, CLE crs. for ethics, professionalism, or substance abuse may be applied to any substantive law, practice and procedure requirement, but no more than twice the current annual CLE requirement may be continued into the two succeeding years.

Puerto Rico

24 credit hours of continuing legal education per compliance period.

Rhode Island

10 hrs. per year including 2 hrs. ethics.

South Carolina

14 hrs. per year including 2 hrs. ethics/professional responsibility each reporting period.

Tennessee

15 hrs. per year. Including 3 hrs. ethics/professionalism.

Texas

15 hrs. per year including 3 hrs. legal ethics. 1 hr. of the 3 hrs. of legal ethics may be completed through self-study. 5 hrs. of the total 15 hrs. may be completed through self-study.

Utah

27 hrs. every 2-years including 3 hrs. ethics each reporting period.

Vermont

20 hrs. over 2-yrs. including 2 hrs. ethics each reporting period.

Virginia

12 hrs. per year including 2 hrs. ethics each reporting period.

Washington

45 hrs. over 3 yrs. including 6 hrs. ethics, professionalism, anti-bias and diversity. At least 30 credits must be earned by attendance at live CLE programs, and up to 15 may be earned by self-study.

West Virginia

24 hrs. over 2-yrs. including 3 hrs. ethics or office management or substance abuse per cycle.

Wisconsin

30 hrs. over 2-yrs. including 3 hrs. ethics and professional responsibility.

Wyoming

15 hrs. per year including 1 hr. ethics.